

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated August 20, 2004, no claims have been amended, canceled or added. Claims 1-66 remain in the application. Re-consideration of the application is requested.

II. Prior Art Rejections

Beginning on page (2) of the Office Action, claims 1-16, 19-38, 41-60, and 63-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Padwick, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Outlook 2002," (Padwick) in view of Rand et al, U.S. Publication No. US 2004/0080528 A1 (Rand). Beginning on page (15) of the Office Action, claims 17-18, 39-40 and 61-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Padwick in view of Rand, and further in view of Abu-Hakima et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0020749 A1 (Abu-Hakima).

Applicant's attorney respectfully traverses these rejections. Specifically, Applicant's attorney submits herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 by inventor Lee Anne Kowalski to eliminate Padwick, Rand and Abu-Hakima as references.

Applicant's invention was conceived prior to June 21, 2000, and thereafter diligently reduced it to practice in this country as evidenced by the following:

(a) Applicant conceived the invention described in the above-identified patent application in this country prior to June 21, 2000, as evidenced by the "Disclosure" document attached hereto as an exhibit. The "Disclosure" document describes the invention, and fully supports the claims in the above-identified patent application.

(b) Although the dates on the "Disclosure" document are redacted, the following dates are prior to June 21, 2000:

- (i) on page 1, the "Created On" date,
- (ii) on page 1, the "Submitted Date",
- (iii) on page 2, the date answering "**Question 1 On what date was the invention workable",
- (iv) on page 5, the date that "[t]his evaluation was entered ..." under "Evaluation",
- (v) on page 5, the "Date rated" under "Team Evaluation", and
- (vi) on page 5, the "Date sent" under "Search Information".

(c) Development of the invention proceeded on a continuous basis from prior to June 21, 2000, eventually culminating in the filing of the above-identified United States Utility Patent Application No. 09/928,599 on August 13, 2001.

Thus, Applicant's attorney submits that independent claims 1, 23, and 45 are allowable over the references. Further, dependent claims 2-22, 24-44, and 46-66 are submitted to be allowable over the references in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 23, and 45, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-22, 24-44, and 46-66 recite additional novel elements not shown by the references.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: September 20, 2005

By: George H. Gates
Name: George H. Gates
Reg. No.: 33,500

GHG/mrj

Enclosures: Declaration
Disclosure document